

variety, ranging, as actually cited and mapped by McClintock & Epling, to the northern tip of Vancouver Island at the west, to the border of Minnesota at the east. In the eastern part of its range it passes insensibly into var. *mollis* and various specimens in the Gray Herbarium labelled by the recent reviewers of the genus as *M. menthaefolia* are inseparable from others marked by them as *M. fistulosa*.—M. L. FERNALD.

THE VALIDITY OF LITHOSPERMUM LATIFOLIUM.—In the Report of the State Botanist of New York for 1921, House treats *Lithospermum latifolium* Michx. Fl. Bor.-Am. i. 131 (1803) as a later homonym and proposes, N. Y. State Mus. Bull. no. 243-244: 61 (1923), a new combination for it:

Lithospermum luteum (Raf.) comb. nov.

- L. latifolium* Michx. Fl. Bor. Am., I: 131. 1803. Not Forsk. 1775
Cyphorina latifolia Raf. Am. Mo. Mag., 4: 191. 1819
Cyphorina lutea Raf. Cat. 13. 1824
L. lutescens N. Coleman, Cat. Pl. Grand Rapids. 29. 1874

Passing for the moment the fact that Rafinesque's proposed genus was *Cyphorima*, the most important point is House's belief that Forskål published a species *Lithospermum latifolium* in 1775. To be sure, this name was given by Jackson in Index Kewensis, under *Lithospermum*: "*latifolium*, Forsk. Fl. Aegypt. Arab. 39 = *callosum*"; but this seems to be one of the hundreds of cases where those who worked on Jackson's great bibliographic undertaking "put one over on him". Search in two copies of Forskål shows no *L. latifolium*; he had 5 species of that genus, *L. hispidum* (p. 38), *L. heliotropioides* (p. 39), *L. ciliatum* (p. 39), *L. angustifolium* (p. 39) and *L. digynum* (p. 40). There is no *L. latifolium* but the last phrase on the page, following the habitat, "In desertis Káhirinis", and the Arabic name, is "Characteres *Lithosp. Purp. caer. sed nec repens, neque latifolium*". The last line ends halfway across the bottom of the page and its final "*latifolium*" evidently caught the eye of the tired indexer. Wondering how Jackson got the clew that the supposed *L. "latifolium, Forsk."* of Index Kewensis was the same as *L. callosum*, said by Jackson to grow in "Am. bor.; Peruv.", we

find it by turning to the original account of *L. callosum* Vahl, *Symbolae Botanicae, sive Plantarum, tam earum, quas in Itinere, imprimis Orientali, collegit Petrus Forskål, etc.* i. 14 (1790). Vahl said nothing about North America and Peru. Instead, he based his *L. callosum* upon the *L. angustifolium* Forsk. and, like Forskål, gave its "Habitat in desertis Kahirinis". In other words, *L. callosum* Vahl (1790) was an illegitimate substitute for *L. angustifolium* Forsk. (1775). There is apparently no *L. latifolium* Forsk.¹, *L. callosum* did not come from "Am. bot.; Peruv.", and *L. "angustifolium, Forsk. Aegypt. Arab. 39 = callosum"* of Index Kewensis should read *callosum* Vahl, *Symb. Bot. i. 14 = angustifolium*; to those who are not callous to puns the whole story is one of extreme carelessness.

There is no need for the name *Lithospermum luteum* (Raf.) House (1923). As originally published by Rafinesque, *Cat. 13* (1824), the name *Cyphorima lutea* was a substitute-name for a species already with a valid name, therefore illegitimate; Rafinesque simply said "Cyphorima lutea Raf. *Lithospermum latifolium* auct [i. e. Michaux.]". The genus *Cyphorima* had been properly published by Raf. *Am. Mo. Mag. Crit. Rev. iv. 191* (1819) with the brief but definite characterization:

"32. *Lithospermum latifolium, Batschia longiflora, and B. decumbens, N., must form a peculiar genus Cyphorima, distinguished by having five protuberances at the mouth of the corolla, gibbose inside, hollow outside.*"

As Dr. Merrill points out to me, neither here nor in later publications did Rafinesque make formal transfers of the specific names. These transfers were made for him by Jackson in Index Kewensis, Jackson repudiating the genus *Cyphorima* and reducing it to *Lithospermum*, his combinations, consequently, published in synonymy; they should, therefore, be quoted as *C. decumbens* Raf. ex Jackson in synonymy, and *C. latifolia* [Jackson said *-ium*] and *C. longiflora* do. Such are the intricacies of nomenclature and bibliography!—M. L. FERNALD.

¹ In *Contrib. Gray Herb. n. s. lxx. 26* (1924) Dr. I. M. Johnston noted that "Forskål did not publish such a binomial."